

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

KEYWANIE S BRIDGEWATER,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSEPHINUM BUILDING STAFF,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-01594-TL

ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH  
PREJUDICE

This matter is before the Court on its own motion. On October 16, 2023, Plaintiff filed a proposed complaint but failed to pay the required filing fee, among other procedural deficiencies. Dkt. No. 1, *see also* Dkt. No. 3 (Notice of Filing Deficiency). Plaintiff then filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). Dkt. No. 5. Plaintiff’s application for IFP status was granted, but U.S. Magistrate Judge S. Kate Vaughan recommended review of the proposed complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Dkt. No. 6. The Complaint was entered on the docket on October 30, 2023. Dkt. No. 7. Upon review of the Complaint, the Court found that Plaintiff failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and dismissed this case without

1 prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Dkt. No. 8. The Court granted Plaintiff leave to file an  
2 amended complaint to correct the deficiencies identified in the Court's Order, by no later than  
3 Friday, December 1, 2023, or else the case would be dismissed in its entirety. *Id.*

4 Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint as directed.<sup>1</sup> The Court therefore ORDERS  
5 this case DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. Judgment shall be entered separately in accordance with  
6 this order.

7 Dated this 7th day of December 2023.

8   
9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 Tana Lin  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 <sup>1</sup> The Court notes that after its Order of Dismissal with Leave to Amend was entered, Defendant filed a Praecipe to  
23 Issue Summons. Dkt. No. 9. The Clerk issued another deficiency letter related to the newly provided summons form.  
24 Dkt. No. 10. It is unclear if this second deficiency letter was received by Plaintiff, because it was returned  
undeliverable. Dkt. No. 11. Nonetheless, the Local Civil Rules place the burden on Plaintiff to maintain a current  
address with the Court. *See* LCR 41(b)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff's failure to timely respond to the Court's prior  
order of dismissal—which was not returned undeliverable—is sufficient to warrant dismissal with prejudice.